

Rosenblatt. (W. M.)

## THE JEWISH DIETARY SYSTEM.

372

THAT curious code which has so long controlled the Israelite in the selection of his food, and in its preparation and use, has been to many an interested observer the subject of unsatisfied inquiry. There can, indeed, be few whose attention these dietary practices have not at some time attracted; who have not obtained surprised glimpses of a Jewish kitchen; who have not wondered at encountering Jewish markets, or paused to decipher the word *kosher* inscribed in Hebrew characters before Jewish restaurants; and the Israelite on his travels, carrying his meals with him like Sir Moses Montefiore, instead of stopping at the inns by the wayside, has frequently been the occasion of comment and study. Everybody knows that the Israelite eats no pork, and song and story have been founded on that quaint fact; and all have heard of the Passover festival and its unleavened bread, and would like to know more about them. In some European countries, and especially in Germany, knowledge of the religious practices of the Jews is much more detailed, accurate, and widely diffused; and it is known, for instance, not only that the pig is forbidden food, but that there are few quadrupeds which are not. In the United States only enough is known of this and kindred subjects to make the general public desirous of learning more.

But if this topic is generally one of interest, it should be peculiarly so at the present moment. For many centuries have the dietary regulations been observed with extraordinary strictness and faithfulness; but at last their time has come, and they are falling so rapidly into disuse that already to-day to a large proportion of even the Jewish youth much of what I may say will be strange, although twenty

years ago there was hardly a Jewish boy anywhere who was not familiar with it all, and with much more that I shall have no opportunity to introduce. There is a portion of the Jewish people, even in the United States, from whom the dietary code still receives scrupulous obedience; but from the larger number it is meeting with the same fate as many other practices that have made the same eventful journey through history. The present, therefore, is perhaps an especially appropriate time to speak of them.

The principal dietary laws date back in their origin to the days of Moses, it being in the Pentateuch that the fundamental ordinances are found. Some are to-day very nearly in their original form, no effort being made to extend their application; others, however, have received many additions, and still others, which in the Bible are of doubtful meaning, and may never have been designed for such a construction as they have received, have been elaborated by the rabbins into complex regulations which require for their proper observance much time and attention, and often unnecessary expense. It is thus this system has been established.

The dietary code relates almost entirely to animal food. None of the products of the vegetable kingdom are under ordinary circumstances forbidden, nor is the manner of their use limited. There is, in fact, in reference to them no dietary law whatever of practical importance, except, as I shall presently show, in connection with the Passover festival.

As to animal food, the first ordinance requires that the quadruped, fowl, or fish shall be, in the Biblical sense, "clean." The law on this point is laid down in Leviticus xi., and is partially reiterated in Deuteronomy xiv.;

"There you are," cries this man as he hangs up a figure of a cow. "Whoever gets that will always have milk in his coffee"; and as he puts up a horse, "Here is an animal who costs nothing for his keep and will never get spavined in his legs—now for it, my little man—*bang, ça y est*"; and as he places a spoon, "Now, my little lady, there is nothing better in life than a spoon—except something to put in it—*bang, ça y est*," which elicits a shout of laughter from the nurses, one of whom observes to another, "*Est-il drôle—cet animal!*" Then there are the revolving swings and boats, the first vertical and the latter horizontal, filled with gayly dressed children, whose peals of laughter fall pleasantly on the ear. Groups play at rolyboly on the ground; others play at make-believe, which recalls to mind the phrase at home consecrated to this interesting business—"You *purtend*, you know, that you are Mrs. So-and-so, etc.," for which the little French people

have nearly equivalent language. Not far off are several theatres for the little folk—the French Punch and Judy, well provided with seats in front of each, round which a cordon is stretched to mark the line between those who pay and those who do not. The benches are filled with children accompanied by nurses and mothers, and a few fathers. Here the cup of joy runs over. Riding behind goats and on wooden horses, ascending and descending in a circular swing, may be very pleasant, but they become pale in comparison with the *Guignol*—the usual name of the diminutive theatre—and it makes one laugh sympathetically to see and hear them in their hilarity. Within ear-shot of all this is the music of the great band of the circus as a running accompaniment, now high, now low, as the breeze withholds or carries the sound. The place of the Rue de l'Enfer indeed presents a gloomy picture compared to this.

ALBERT RHODES.

## TWO BABIES.

LITTLE winsome baby Fay  
Like a snow-white rosebud lay  
In her mother's arms all day.

Alice, dancing up and down—  
Rosy, saucy, dimpling, brown—  
Breaks her playthings, tears her gown.

O the eyes of little Fay!  
Solemn, sweet, and dream-like they,  
Telling mysteries away.

Alice's eyes are wildly bright,  
Full of frank and fearless light.  
Scarcely will they close at night.

Fay so gently shows her love,  
Cooing, nestling like a dove,  
She your very heart would move.

Alice with a tightened strain  
Hugs with tiny might and main—  
Kisses, laughs—and hugs again

Witching each in her own way,  
Alice and the little Fay:  
One so gentle—one so gay.

Heavenly Father, give these flowers  
Summer days and rainbow showers.  
Let the clouds and storms be ours.

FANNY BARROW.

and in all the many centuries that have since expired it has undergone no alteration. There we see that quadrupeds, to be fit for food, must chew the cud and be cloven-footed; and some that are clean and a number that are forbidden are particularly mentioned. To enlarge a little on this list, we may say that among animals not eaten are, of course, the horse, the ass, the squirrel, and the rabbit. Those famed delicacies, bears' paws and beavers' tails, are in the catalogue of the prohibited. In China an orthodox Israelite cannot partake of the cat, nor, in Brazil, of the tapir; but on the other hand, if he can have it properly slaughtered, there is no sufficient reason why, on the western prairies, he should not feast on the savory hump of the buffalo.

Of fowls that are unclean, we find in the chapters referred to an enumeration of twenty-four. All others are regarded as clean; the only difficulty consists in identifying those that are by name forbidden. The translations of this list differ widely, and among Talmudic commentators there is the same uncertainty as with later scholars. They have suggested certain peculiarities in the formation of the feet and stomach as marking the unclean bird; but the possibility of mistake notwithstanding has impressed the rabbins so gravely that they have advised the scrupulous Israelite after all to eat of no fowl unless he is convinced, for reasons beyond these suggested peculiarities, that it does not belong to the prohibited two dozen. It may be stated as a general rule that all birds of prey are forbidden, and that birds which feed on grains are clean. This is, of course, a more agreeable classification to the Israelitish epicure than that of quadrupeds.

In the same chapters we see also that things which both creep and fly, with the exception of beetles, locusts, and grasshoppers, and things which creep only, like the lizard and the tortoise, as well as those which drag themselves along after the manner

of serpents, are all pronounced unclean.

The prohibition of all marine animals, except such as have fins and scales, leaves to the Israelite, as we know, the enjoyment of the best fish. Trout, pickerel, salmon, mackerel—in short, every variety that is ordinarily used as food, and is deemed worth eating, is clean. The eel is among the abominations, and the seal and the alligator are forbidden, whether we class them with land or with marine animals. Such also is the case with the oyster, the clam, the lobster, the crab, and the shrimp. To the orthodox Israelite these are, sad to say, unknown subjects of gastronomy, and turtle soup and terrapin stew must likewise remain impenetrable mysteries.

For the slaughter of fish there are no directions. They may be eaten though they die naturally on being taken out of their element, and in this respect their case is different from that of quadrupeds and fowls. The general rule is that an animal must be put to death according to certain formulas. If it die naturally or of accident or disease; if it be torn by a beast of prey, speared by an Indian, or brought down by the bullet of a sportsman; if it be drowned, like the ducks that are caught in nets in Great Shinnecock Bay, or robbed of its breath by the air pump of an experimentalist—nay, even though it be deprived of life in the most humane and scientific way, according to the latest French theory, to the orthodox Israelite it is nevertheless in the list of the forbidden. To be proper food for him, the animal's throat must be cut clean to such depth that the wind-pipe and gullet are severed, and it must then bleed to death. The wound must be inflicted by a person, known as *shochet*, who has studied the art, and is familiar with all the regulations relating to it, and whom the rabbinical authorities have properly authorized to discharge this duty. He must use a knife which has been sharpened to its highest capacity, and which has a

perfect edge. It is also his duty after the animal's death to examine the carcass, and to see that it was in sound health: any indications of a disease render it unfit for food. Eruptions are fatal, and so are foreign substances in the vitals which may have engendered disease. The lungs are examined with especial minuteness, and almost any malformation or unsoundness there will cause the whole body to be rejected. Such inspection is made only with reference to quadrupeds. With fowls it is deemed comparatively unnecessary, although even in their case the same general rules apply as to the effect of foreign matter and of symptoms of unsoundness. But they must be slaughtered precisely as the larger animals are, and, as I have said, a partridge that is shot on the wing may tempt, but it cannot seduce the orthodox Israelite. Flesh cut from a living animal, as the Abyssinians were once said to have cut their steaks, is likewise prohibited.

One effect of these multifarious regulations is to create a necessity for Jewish butchers and Jewish markets, and to increase considerably the price of meat. The Israelite cannot purchase at a Gentile market of a Gentile butcher, unless the latter has a special department, in charge of an Israelite of known trustworthiness, for the accommodation of Jewish purchasers; and even then the meat that is *kosher*\* is marked by the certificate of the *shochet*. The latter, as I have shown, must be a gentleman of special education, and properly requires to be paid for the professional use of his knife; and this outlay, with the cost of extra attention, care, and labor, must ultimately be paid by the consumer.

\* *Kosher* strictly means "proper," "correct." It is not the word used in the Pentateuch to indicate animals that are "clean," but it has by degrees come to be used even in that sense; popularly it now means everything that is sanctioned by the dietary laws, or is prepared in conformity with them. *T'refah* is an analagous word, originally meaning merely "torn," as by a beast of prey on a field; but it has come popularly to mean the reverse of *kosher*; i. e., everything that is proscribed by the dietary laws.

The laws relative to slaughter are purely rabbinical creations. The Pentateuch proscribes the flesh of an animal which is torn by beasts of prey or dies of itself, but beyond this it is the rabbins who have established the prevalent mode of slaughter. It is obvious that in prescribing these many formalities, they had partly sanitary reasons, although it now seems to be pretty well settled that there is probably no disease of which an animal dies wherein the flesh may not be rendered innocuous to the consumer by cooking. (See "Medical Gazette" of New York, Vol. iv., No. 7; paper by Dr. Rogers.) It is also obvious that they wished to avoid inflicting unnecessary pain, as in the direction to use a well sharpened knife. Of course there are other modes of death which are still less painful; but this precise mode of slaying their beeves is essential, and they can only provide that it be done as humanely as possible. I say essential, for, as is well known to butchers in general, where cattle are thus slaughtered the blood-vessels are more speedily and certainly drained; and this is an object of the first importance with the Israelite. Under penalty of being "cut off from his people" ("perishing"), is he forbidden to eat of blood (Leviticus vii. 26). In other chapters the prohibition is repeated more at length, and even more emphatically.

Such an express command is to be obeyed with corresponding fidelity. First, therefore, they inflict the lingering death I have described, and after the body is cut up, remove all the larger veins and arteries, this being done by persons who have studied the anatomy of the quadruped, and are known to be thoroughly conversant with it. The meat is then sold, and each purchaser takes his portion home; and there he immerses it in water for one hour, and afterward buries it in salt for another. Not until that process is concluded is it considered ready for cooking. But it should be remarked that it has been determined by

good authority that if the meat is broiled, so that any blood which remains in it may have an opportunity to run out, the previous salting and watering are unnecessary; and many a faithful Israelite takes advantage of this discrimination, and has his juicy steak for breakfast, where otherwise it might cause such inconvenience as to be impracticable.

Other rules concerning the preparation of the meat are those relating to the fat and to the hip sinew. Certain parts of the former are forbidden as food (Leviticus vii. 24, and elsewhere), for the reason that they were used in the sacrificial services; the latter is proscribed because Jacob happened to sprain his hip while wrestling (Genesis xxxii. 33). The prohibited fat (Exodus xix. 13, and elsewhere) is that which lies about the kidneys and surrounds the entrails (not that between the intestines), and it is easily removed; but much more troublesome and serious in its consequences is the abstraction of the forbidden sinew; for this, as is well known, runs a devious road, and to follow it along its whole course necessitates such disfigurement of the hindquarter as renders it unsalable to the Gentile purchaser. The butcher must therefore either be able to sell it all to Jews (which he can seldom do, so large a Jewish custom rarely existing in one place, at least in the United States), or he cannot afford to have it touched by the dissecting knife at all, and consequently cannot sell any portion of it to Jewish purchasers; and thus it comes that the orthodox Israelite, already so limited in his choice of meats, is also debarred, as a general thing, from the enjoyment of the noble porterhouse, the alluring tenderloin, or even the generous sirloin; for, as is well known, they all lie within the territory through which the forbidden sinew meanders.

Where the Jewish community is large enough to render it necessary, a professional dissector comes into requisition. As a graduated slaughterer is demanded, so are there also gentle-

men who have studied the removal of the exasperating hip-cord, and have been duly admitted to practise by the rabbinical authorities. Conscientious treatises are published for their instruction, and diagrams and maps are in existence which illustrate this branch of anatomy with most commendable fidelity.

Having selected and prepared our meat, our next inquiry must be into its relations with milk. There is in Exodus xxiii. 19, and repeated elsewhere, a mysterious ordinance forbidding the seething of the kid in the milk of its mother. The purpose and real meaning of this passage have been the subject of much discussion. According to a popular opinion, it is a figurative prohibition of unnecessary cruelty (like the passage forbidding the slaughter of a cow and its calf on the same day), the cooking of an animal in its own mother's milk being supposed to show a barbarous disregard for the ties and relations of nature. A more reasonable explanation, perhaps, is that of Maimonides, who thinks that there was an ancient idolatrous practice, of which the seething of a kid in its mother's milk was a part, and that Moses aimed to destroy it by this prohibition. It is evident that unless the latter be accepted as the true purpose of the passage, it cannot receive a literal interpretation, for that would make it unintelligible. The rabbinical scholars who took up the business of construing it, clearly did not accept the view of Maimonides. Neither did they give the passage a strict rendering (nor a liberal one either, for the matter of that), but on this extremely slight foundation they have constructed a variety of dietary regulations, that give the faithful Israelite a great deal of trouble.

Not only is it forbidden to seethe a kid in its mother's milk, but it is equally improper to put the calf through the same process. In fact, to be brief, no meat whatever—that is, the flesh of quadrupeds and fowls—is allowed to be cooked in milk or to be

eaten with it; and this applies as well to all forms of meat and milk and to all preparations containing either.

If an orthodox Israelite likes his cup of coffee after dinner, he must take it black. If he insists on the buckwheat cake at breakfast, he must do without his steak. Ice cream is a forbidden follower of roast beef, mince pie an impossible companion of Swiss cheese; while in the useful sandwich the dainty slice of tongue dare never repose within covers of buttered bread (unless, perhaps, the butter is made of fat—butterine—in the ingenious style lately invented; but even then, I suppose, one must be sure that none of the forbidden fat about the kidneys and entrails was used in the preparation).

In order to secure the strict observance of these regulations, it is even customary for meat food and milk food to have distinct kitchen and table utensils—pots, pans, dishes, etc.; and these are no more allowed to come in contact than the food for whose preparation they are intended. The knife which has carved a duck should not touch the butter plate, nor the teaspoon jostle the dinner pepper box. How inconvenient this custom of separate dishes must be, it is easy to see. The greatest vigilance is necessary to prevent their intermingling; and where the servants are wholly or partly Gentile, what a task has their mistress in making them understand the complicated ways of such a household.

In estimating the time that must intervene between the use of meat and milk food, an important distinction is taken. Where the latter is eaten first, only half an hour at the furthest need elapse, but where the former precedes, the period should strictly be as much as three hours. The reason for this is a notion which existed among the elders of Israel, that milk food will necessarily digest much sooner than the other; and it is deemed improper to mix the two even in the stomach.

Speaking of a double set of dishes brings us to the festival of the Pass-

over, for which another double set is needed. The observance of this festival is prescribed in Exodus xxiii. (see also Leviticus xxiii. and Deuteronomy xvi.). It occurs in the Jewish month of Abib (Nisan), usually about the latter part of March or the beginning of April in the calendar year, and lasts strictly seven days, although the more orthodox observe eight, owing to an uncertainty which once arose about the almanac, and from which in all these many centuries they have not recovered. The first day and the last are sacred, and are marked by a total suspension of work. There are services in the synagogues of unusual length and solemnity, at which persons attend who do not observe a Sabbath in the whole year. They close their shops every where; dwellers in the country, where there are no Jewish communities, repair to the city and put up with friends, or at Jewish inns, until the week is over, travellers return to their homes, and in fine every stray orthodox lamb puts in an appearance. An unusual amount of friendliness and benevolence are prevalent, and the enjoyment is general.

But after all, these are not the distinguishing features of the Passover. All the festivals are marked more or less in this way. Its real characteristic is its unleavened food, and the operation which this peculiar diet has upon Jewish tables. All leavened food and fermented drink are prohibited, and everything containing any admixture of either, such matter being known by its Hebrew name, *chometz*. With respect to this the festival is observed with extraordinary strictness. By noon the day before the Passover sets in, every house is completely cleaned. All table and kitchen utensils, dishes of every description, knives, forks, table covers, wine glasses—everything, in fine, that has even the remotest connection with the preparation or consumption of food or drink, besides, of course, all unconsumed groceries, are removed to the attic or some other distant and

unoccupied quarter of the house. In place of all this houseware an equally complete array, which has never been used except for the unleavened food of this festival, is brought down from the attic, and arrayed for a week's brief service. Each little Israelitish lamb has probably its own private Passover mug, the gift, perhaps, of some friend or relative; and how the youngsters rejoice over their familiar favorites as they are taken from their year's confinement. While these dishes are used the greatest care is taken to prevent their contact with *chometz*. Should such collision accidentally happen, the contaminated utensil, in thoroughly orthodox households, is sundered from the rest of the Passover ware, and thereafter is doomed to perpetual association with the plebeian crockery up stairs.

This may be imagined extremely strict observance of the Passover, but it is after all a little behind the fashion the Jews have in some European countries. There they not only remove their dishes, provisions, etc., to some unoccupied room, but symbolically they give them away. They raise the presumption not only that their every-day ware is out of sight, but that there is no such thing in the house belonging to them. In Deuteronomy the command reads: "No leavened bread shall be seen in all thy coasts seven days." So they seek some trusty Gentile friend, and give him the key of the room in which the *chometz* is stored, and with it make over to him all the contents of the chamber. This is certainly a good symbolical delivery, and fully at ease, our Israelitish friend now proceeds to the observance and enjoyment of the festival. Of course, when the Passover is ended, his Gentile acquaintance makes up his mind he doesn't care for the gift, and returns it.

Thus it is that kitchen and table ware is secured which has not been defiled by contact with *chometz*. To have the same assurance of the food itself is even more difficult, and ne-

cessitates even more care. The prohibition of fermented liquors and unleavened food of course does not embrace meats, eggs, fish, nor milk, thus depriving the faithful Israelite of none of the really important items on the bill of fare; but even as to those, no contact with *chometz* should have defiled them. The meat is therefore slaughtered and prepared with redoubled care, and the milk, wherever possible, is taken from the cow under the immediate supervision of a trusty Israelite. So no article that is ordinarily included under "groceries and provisions" is used unless it comes from some reliable Jewish source, with the assurance that it has been prepared with proper vigilance. The orthodox Israelite has his Passover wine, his Passover coffee, his Passover spices, and his Passover raisins and prunes, all of which he purchases at a considerable advance on the general market price of similar commodities.

It is, however, in the preparation of pastry that the observance of the Passover gives most trouble. The place of the ordinary bread is supplied by a flat cake—the *mazoh*—which is made of wheat flour and water, without yeast, and baked hard. There are probably few who read this who have not seen the Passover bread. In preparing other pastry ordinary flour is altogether avoided. For their puddings, pies, cakes, etc., they use a flour made either of the potato or of the Passover bread itself—the latter being ground to fine meal and then baked over again, coming out in a different shape, in conjunction with raisins, sugar, eggs, and the various other chemicals that belong to a housewife's laboratory.

Take it all in all, the Passover week is a very pleasant period. It comes but once a year, and is therefore agreeable as a matter of variety. The complete renovation of the whole household helps to the cheerful impression; the ingathering of all stray sheep, the cessation from work for two or three days, the consciousness which

the faithful Israelite has of strictly obeying what he considers Divine commands of much importance, but above all, the change in Israelitish bills of fare—these things all help to make the Passover a real festival. During that week the Israelite lives well. He more than makes up for the absence of the leavened and fermented. The table groans beneath the best that the pocket of paterfamilias can afford. The housewife exerts all her skill in the art of cookery, and numerous are the palatable dishes which by degrees have become part of this week, and are prepared without fail after traditional recipes. The *mazoth* pudding, the *mazoth* dumpling—what faithful Israelite knows them not? Even the poorest among the children of Israel enjoy themselves during this week; and if they find it difficult to buy Passover luxuries themselves, some wealthier son of Israel is usually found to provide them. Thus they can look back one half the year, and forward the other half, to at least one unstinted week, and indulge in delightful reminiscences or sweeter anticipations.

The other festivals of the Jewish year in no way concern the dietary laws, except in that it is the practice—and a sound one—to live as much better than usual as the pecuniary condition of the household will permit.

Good and generous living, I may say in passing, is practised also on the Sabbath, and meat, fish, and wine are all three indispensable to a perfectly proper observance of the sacred day. (It may here be stated incidentally that the good Jewish housewife understands the preparation of fish and the most palatable sauces thereto better than the most ingenious of your artist cooks. The more orthodox she is, the better are her fish. If she hails from Poland, her fish are perfection. There is never a Friday evening—the Sabbath eve—but fish are on the table; and if anybody doubts my assertions, I would advise him to secure an invitation to supper at such a time.)

In the preceding exposition I have stated the dietary practices as properly they are, and as the really orthodox Israelite ought to observe them; but, as I have already intimated, their day is past, and they are swiftly falling into neglect. There was a time when they received a most implicit observance. They were considered not simply as sanitary or humanitarian regulations, but as solemn and important religious ordinances. Commentaries and treatises were published on them, and in expounding them the most subtle technicalities and frequently the most ridiculous were indulged in. The stringent directions found in Leviticus xi. 32 to 35 were everywhere literally followed, and a housewife might often be seen to throw to the dogs a whole dish of meat because a few drops of milk had fallen into it, or burying a knife in the ground for days, or burning an iron pot to a red heat, because the flesh of an unclean animal had defiled them. A faithful Israelite while travelling would carry with him food that had been prepared at home, or, if the journey were too long for that, would live off boiled eggs and potatoes cooked in the skin, the theory being that the shell of the egg and the skin of the potato preserve them from contamination when lying in an unclean pot. So Jews who lived in the country apart from a community of their co-religionists, finding no facilities for having the larger animals properly slaughtered, often abstained for extended periods from the use of their meat. I have no doubt there was and is many an Israelite who, were he suddenly so circumstanced that for two or three days it would be impossible to procure *kosher* food, would starve himself during that period rather than eat of the unclean; nor was it an unusual thing to hear of an Israelite uprooting his business and his residence and migrating, solely on account of the inconvenience of keeping a *kosher* table in the place where he was located.

Such was formerly the invariable

practice of well-nigh all. To-day there are still many who may be counted among the faithful. In the United States they are mostly past middle age, and from abroad, comparatively illiterate, and wedded to the customs of their younger days. If they have an education, it is usually of a religious nature—a Hebrew education—which is not calculated to hasten the march of innovation. By them the dietary practices are maintained with unabated rigor. In the larger cities they furnish support to numerous Jewish restaurants where they lunch; and in every town in which they are settled in sufficient numbers they maintain a Jewish inn. In Jewish charitable establishments of all kinds the kitchen is thoroughly orthodox. Even in the city of New York this is the case; and to satisfy some of their supporters those excellent institutions, the Mount Sinai Hospital and the Jewish Orphan Asylum, are conducted on a strictly *kosher* system, although many of their most generous friends laugh at the dietary laws, root and branch. In Berlin, where the Jews are in part as liberal and in part as orthodox as they are in the United States, orthodoxy is even showing enterprise; for recently an Israelitish association was formed there for the purpose of slaughtering cattle in the Jewish fashion in Australia, or some other section of the globe where they are plenty and cheap, and exporting the meat, salted, smoked, condensed into beef-extract, and in other approved forms, to Jewish communities all over the world. But *kosher* beef-extract is not more curious than *kosher* soap for Israelitish crockery; and the latter is a well-known preparation, over whose invention the Jewish housewife rejoices. (There are two varieties, one made of animal fat, to be used in cleaning pots and dishes that are devoted to meat, the other made of butter and intended for dishes devoted to milk food.) Through orthodoxy, too, the manufacture of unleavened bread for the Passover is made a considera-

ble industry, extensive bakeries being established in some of the larger cities, from which, when Passover week comes on, the *mazoth* are shipped all over the country. Of some importance also is the trade in other Passover food.

All this, however, as I have said, is rapidly changing. No doubt, there are some among the sternly orthodox upon whom the spirit of the times can have no effect. Grown up, perhaps, in lands where there was a wide gulf—prejudice and gross civil inequality—between them and their Christian neighbors, their natures, as a matter of course, have become hardened against the influences of the Gentile world, and over their ways and habits no change can be expected to come. For them to eat buttered bread with meat would, I imagine, be more than merely improper—more than sin; I have no doubt that the habit of a lifetime would create, beyond the mere question of right or wrong, an unconquerable physical aversion.

These extremely orthodox, however, form really but a small number. There are others who call themselves orthodox, and who still pretend allegiance, but these are nevertheless daily thinking less of the propriety of what they eat. They may be old, and for that reason alone be disinclined to make a radical change in their habits, or they may not have the courage; otherwise, perhaps, they would openly profess their indifference. Very many, on the other hand, simply deride the whole dietary system, and these include, I think I may safely say, almost the entire younger generation. The most conservative in relation to this subject, as might be expected, are the women. Even they, however, are moving with the rest; and what is most interesting about this onward march is that it is almost imperceptible if observed for a short period, yet in the course of years is surprising in its results; that it is not publicly advocated by anybody—by some is even violently deprecated—and neverthe-

less its progress is as steady as the passage of time.

This may be explained, I think, by the fact that the dietary system is the result, not of reason, but of authority. Not resting on reason, it needs no argument to overthrow it, but little by little, it fades of itself, as respect for authority, both rabbinical and Biblical, diminishes, and as the wants and conveniences of the times demand.

We have good evidence of the views entertained by the body of American Israelites in the proceedings at the banquet given at the Sherman House in Chicago, January 28, 1874, to the delegates of the B'nai B'rith, assembled in that city. It was tendered by the B'nai B'rith lodges resident in Chicago; but the cooking was done by Gentiles under a Gentile's supervision, and it was beneath a Gentile roof that the table was decked, although there were numerous Jewish inns and restaurants in the city. As may be known, the order of the B'nai B'rith is an organization constituted like the Masonic and other secret associations, but exclusively Jewish; and a large proportion of its lodges are thoroughly orthodox on many points of belief and practise. Yet, if the reports may be credited, three hundred members of the order sat down to that unhallowed banquet. The manner of its preparation was alone enough to render it properly and strictly an abomination in all its parts; but, in addition, we

find the bill of fare full of Satanic inventions—oyster soup, trout with shrimp sauce, "aspic" of lobster, "ornamented" buffalo tongue, *pâté de foie gras*, wild turkey, and to conclude with, ice-cream and other milk food. Here is a sweet mixture of the clean and the unclean—the *kosher* and the forbidden—of dishes improper under any circumstances; of others improperly prepared; and to cap the climax, a confusion of meat and milk. It was only necessary to set a juicy, roasted sucking pig upon the table, to complete this insurrection against the dietary authorities of Israel.

It is certainly interesting to note the decay of a code which has been elaborated so carefully, and been observed so long and scrupulously as that which has controlled the Jewish kitchen; but strange it is not. It is in perfect keeping with the marked change that is coming over all the religious practices of the Israelite, as well as over his belief. Most distinct is that change in the United States and in Germany; but in time, no doubt, it will extend to all quarters of the globe. Only the opportunities offered by free institutions and general enlightenment are required, and it cannot be long before the Israelite will discard every religious principle that fails to stand the test of reason, and all religious practices that he finds unmeaning and inconvenient.

W. M. ROSENBLATT. ✓